

## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <a href="http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content">http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content</a>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The author has analyzed the subject well, and has then covered, so far as the facts seem to permit, the several heads of the analysis. Thus it has happened that in several instances he has covered topics usually unnoticed. For example (pp. 37-42), he has explained well the distinction between treaties and exchanges of notes, and (pp. 143-148) he has given as to military commissions more information than is easily accessible elsewhere; and (pp. 148-151) he has given interesting details and generalizations as to the power of pardon. He does not, however, have full acquaintance with all the pertinent details regarding executive control in the World War. For example, he does not mention that exchange of notes upon which was based the exclusive jurisdiction of American courts-martial over offenses committed in France by members of the American armed forces or by persons accompanying them, and he does not mention the executive proclamations regulating aircraft.

In the discussion of courts-martial (pp. 142-154), it is noteworthy that the very important case of *Grafton* v. *United States*, 206 U. S. 333, is not mentioned. Such other omissions as have been discovered are doubtless due to inaccessibility of books.

The pamphlet is worthy of revision, enlargement, and republication.

EUGENE WAMBAUGH.

LEADING CASES IN COMMON LAW. By Ernest Cockle and W. Nembhard Hibbert. London: Sweet and Maxwell, Ltd. 1921. pp. xxxiv, 901.

To bring together in a single volume a collection of cases covering the whole field of the common law, is, of course, an impossible task. Even when, as here, the subject matter is confined to the private law of a single jurisdiction, any such volume is sure to be superficial in the extreme. But this ponderous book is not only superficial and incomplete; it is not even well worked out as to those subjects which it does cover. The cases, while in the main well selected, are hopelessly mutilated, so as to become a mere collection of dicta; and the typography is such as to cause the reader to writhe. Moreover, the arrangement of the subjects treated is peculiar. Thus, Contracts, Torts and Damages are grouped together as "The Law of Things"; while under the subhead of Contracts are included Agency, Carriers, Gifts and "Clubs." The law of property, distributed in procedural pigeon-holes, is treated under the section on Torts.

Apparently the volume was prepared for the use of English law students. To an American reviewer, accustomed to the scholarly case-books prepared by law professors, as used in American law schools for the last thirty years, the reasons for publishing such a book are difficult to comprehend. It is certain that the advantages of the case system cannot be gained by studying this hybrid of case-book and text-book; while if intended as a manual for English practitioners, it seems too elementary to be of value.